Caldwell's Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian languages

p. 1. "Tamil the representative language of the family" in proof of which the name தமிழ் might be shown to be identical with Draviḍa. The Malayal. versions of the Purāṇas mention repeatedly the Dramiḷas (= Draviḍas). ḍ & ḷ interchangeable as in Vedic ഈഡ = ഈള. And ள = ழ as in ഈഴം from സിംഹളം. Damiḷo the Pali form of Dramiḷa

p. 4. Tamil called Malabar by the Portuguese, because coming from the Western coast they found the language of the Paravas etc nearly identical with that spoken in Malabar. They always distinguish from it the Badagas or Telughs, as the ruling class, introduced by the Rayers (& making ~~interruptions~~ in South Travancore)

UB TÜBINGEN
Ma I 864-8.
Nr 8

p. 4. "Tamul" probably french orthography - & by them correctly pronounced
p. 6. Karnātaka, also the language of the So. Mahratta country.
It is the language of the Heiga country from Barroor to Sadasheghar, but by the Brahmans at least written with the Mal. or Tulu character.
"Tuluva" is not coextensive with the Canara district, but in the So. the Chandragiri river, in the No. the Calyanapur river are considered as its old boundaries, & the language does not appear to have ever much extended beyond them.
"Codugu" appears to me to lie about midways between Old Can. & Tulu on the one hand, Mal on the other.
The land appears once to have belonged to the Mal. Commonwealth, & the old Gods in it are still Malayalis. (The old demons speak Malayalam all over Coorg).
"Karnātaka is a Sanscr. word". I doubt it. The name Kār-nādu would appropriately designate the black cotton soil of the tableland. The derivation from nāṭaka seems

of other artificial Sanscr. etymologies
p. 7. "five millions" I should think
seven nearer the mark
"from Mangalore" better the Payaswini
river near Chandragiri - caste may be
lost by crossing that river.
"2½ millions" - fully 3 millions
"All along the Mal. coast" too strong
an expression. I do not know exactly
how the case stands near the Neyyāṟu
in the So. But it is only in the gap
that Tamil colonization makes it-
self felt - on the 2 roads towards
Trichoor (Trisiva pērūr) & Ponnāni

"Tamil bids fair to supersede the Mala-
yālam," I fear this is only Sir E. Perry's
view, & he has taken it from commu-
nications of mine, which perhaps
were not worded as cautiously as
might have been done, had this inference
been foreseen. Three millions do not
change their language in 100s & 1000s
of years under a pressure like
the one applied in this case. But I
believe that Christianity will make
Tamil literature extensively

useful in Malabar, as Malayalis willing to learn Tamil (& Christianity supplies the willingness) find it very easy indeed.

p. 8. "Tulu" can hardly be said to be so near Malayalam. It is such a peculiar language, that Mal. people learn Canarese long before they catch Tulu. It may be desirable that it "soon disappear", but I do not hope it. The Tulu people are perhaps the most obstinate of all Dravidians. All Tulu Christians are taught Canarese as well as Tulu.

p. 12. "Mal. has not been cultivated ab intra" — formerly this was the case. The oldest poetry is much more of the Tamil than the Sanscr. mould. All letters besides the 32 were regularly eschewed, the whole literature being in the Tamil ([illegible]) character; Tamil metres abounded, others of a similar character were invented — yet without slavish imitation. The Brahminization of the language & literature appears to me of

comparatively modern date.
"mērku" appears too slight a proof for the immigration of the Mal. people from the East by way of the gap. The western coast must have been peopled before the eastern, if the course of ancient commerce, the analogous progress of the Ariyans to the South etc be taken into account. But kiḻakku & mērku have no doubt been invented in the Tamil country, & the western settlers accepted it a parte fortiori. mēlk" however is rare in Mal. they use instead ~ടിഞ്ഞാറു (old ~ടിഞ്ഞായറു = sunset)
"Peculiar Mal. forms" are only I suppose those of the Neg. verb, which occur in all Sanscritized writings. Verbal roots like pō, var- are taken in their negative form pōgā, varā & then treated like positive verbs. The affix of the present being originally innu, a y is inserted (pōgā-y-innu, varā-y-innu: coḍā-y-innu, & more modern koḍuckā-yinnu) & a whole verb with all modes & tenses is constructed

upon this foundation (cfr. varāgayu came not, kūḍāyum pōt when it will not be possible etc.).

"In writing Tulu" Mal. characters were used by the old Tulu Brahmans, at present only Sanscrit is written with them, & for all ordinary purposes Canarese letters are employed.

p. 19. The Gond interrogative pronoun bo may be like the Tulu vō.

"The conjugational system" of the Tulu offers some analogies to that of the Gond. It is the result of a very voluble contraction of compound verbs.

p. 44. 4) nanikka – a sad mistake, arising probably from the fault of a Copyist, but repeated several times in the book. It is ninakku or ninakku

– 6) oka Tel. from the Tam. & Mal. root o – infin. ooka "to agree, to be one". This root appears in another shape in the Numeral "on" or "oru." Scyth. kir I take to be unconnected with this radical

p. 50. māḳu from maḳu, but this certainly connected with מכר, מחר, מהר

– Chald leth different from Tel. lēdu; this = ila du (i + a = ē), the other composed with "it" is.

p. 56. The alteration of "Sanscr. derivatives" hardly to be ascribed to intense nationalism or jealousy of Brahminical influence. The 2 instances adduced resolve themselves into cases with initial liquids, which appear to have the power of dissolving ō into u + a, ā into a + a; (as on the other hand Telugu changes i + a into ē, f.i. lēdu: & u + a into ō f.i. lō = uḷa). "Iravu" night I take to be original Tamil & Mal., the root ir, iru as in iruḷ (darkness) – the formative avu, or ā, as in vinā & other nouns;

8

ṟatri appears therefore Dravidian (the real Sanscr. nis-nakt)

57. tatsama, tadbhava I would render "the same with it" "arising from it"

– 6., kam I take to be = kammu & would refer to Pracrit changes eliminating the r (as in kattiri scissors, kätten = kartta). The real Tamil tadbh. is kanmam

p. 59 line 4.ˣ The old Mal character is still used with slight variations by the Muselman colonists

p. 61. why should Sōṛa not be written Chōṛa (see notes to & p. 105)

An old Mal. word in Herodotus 3,111 is κάρφεα for cinnamon (Mal [illegible] & [illegible], whence carpura camphor)

p. 62. The Pāṇḍiya embassy to the Western empire proves to my mind that the Malabār coast was then subject to those kings.

Κηροβόθρος Plin. Celebothras. In Mal Kēḷan, Kēḷu are very common names, corrupted from Kēralan. The King's title was no doubt Kērala putra & Kēḷa putra (p. pronounced b as now in Tam. & Mal)

ˣ) Tūṛal in M. sediment, hence camphor = sediment of cinnamon

—Κοττιάρα rather from kōttei fort which compounded with āṟu would in Mal. sound like kōttyāṟu

—"dialectic peculiarities of Mal." I would never found upon terminations preserved by Greeks, as they cared little to reproduce the original sounds (compare Καρούρα

63 Ἀρκάτου probably heard by foreigners in the oblique case "kāṭṭu". I believe simple ḍ they would have rendered by ζ, as p. 65. Κώρυ is probably kōḍu or cōḍi "corner"

"Coromandel" I take to be derived from Chōramaṇḍalam. "Compounds of indigenous Drav. words like chōḷam & Sanscr. words" are hardly inadmissible, if the instance adduced a few lines after (Tondamandalam) be considered. The first Portuguese (Barros, Barbosa, Castanheda etc) write Choramandel, which they say stretches from the end of the kingdom of Coulão (Quilon) to the Udigirmale in the kingdom of Uria. C instead of Ch is a later corruption

10

p. 65. "Cerobothras" compare note 62.
Latin C certainly = Indian k
p. 71, 1. write Daṇḍak-āraṇya as also p. 81.
p. 72. Is "ten" sweet? I take ten honey
to be = tī-y-an "sweetness". But the
Cocoanut rather = Southern tree,
as tradition derives it from Ceylon.
p. 75 "wearing the hair long" is still
the custom of Mal. mountaineers &
other aboriginal castes. There are
good representations of Tivar &
other Mal. castes in ancient voyages,
& they appear invariably with the
long hair.
p. 77. The 18 Royal families of Malabar
are mostly Ariyanized Sudras.
But five of them are stated to be
Cshatriyas, f.i. the 2 families of
Codungalur (Cranganore) & Cochi

p. 78 "tin" & "zinc" have in T. foreign
names but also "lead" (tiyam = sisam)
p. 80. Ramīswaram, S. Ramēswaram
p. 84. If Tamil literature avowedly
excels in ethics, may not the common
name by which Northern neighbours
designated the Tamilas be derived
from this peculiarity. The Arawas
as Tel. & Can. call them, must signify
"Moralists" (aRam = dharma, perh.
distinctly = Buddhist religion?)
Whence the Name Tigalar, which
the Tamilas bear in Canarese?

p. 89. The "lethargy of the Dravidian
mind" seems ~~appears~~ not to have extended
to Malabar. The Kerala utpatti & many
other works appear to be written
in the last century, of course before
Hyder's invasion.
p. 98. ūr appears to me older
than ūru. The Greek termination
in α carries little weight, see to p. 62.
ūra is certainly but modern Malaya
lam."
p. 100. "The Mal. uses invariably short
a for u." This is a mistake, that

pervades the whole Gramar. The very short u of Tamil is still farther shortened in Mal. & hence it has become customary, not to write it when final. Foreigners who are led more by the written sign than by the spoken sound have therefore identified this short u with short a. And there is no doubt that the Syrians especially & the Cochinese in general affect to pronounce them equally. But in the pronunciation of Brahmins & Nayers they differ, & in poetry u is invariably written. In the North of Malabar a dot or little circle over the letter is used to express this sound (f.i. [illegible] = [illegible]). The same custom prevails yet more extensively in Tulu, where the pronunciation is yet more Shva-like. In Tulu you can hardly distinguish if this vowel forms a syllable or serves as a mere apostroph. Hence the difficulty - almost insuperable - of imita-

ting European metres in Tulu (Canarese hymns are sung by the Tulu Christians). The rule which obtains in Tulu is this, short u is retained after labial vowels f.i. bōḍu "must" (= വേണ്ടു) ūru town: all other vowels are followed by this very short & peculiar Shva. (uttered somewhat like a very short German ü, or French u, Greek υ). I suppose that the Telugu i in so many terminations is the result of a similar law of transition. Meanwhile I think, short u ought to be written in Mal., except an apostrophic sign be preferred both for Mal. & Tulu. (p.12. kiṛakk" or kiṛakk - a Dative in "nu" or n")

p.101. the final a in tala is not a pure a, but a slight modification of the palatal sound ei. Hence the forms തലക്കു or തലെക്കു in the Dative, മലെക്കൽ near the mountain; the neutre verb aḍayu forms the active verb aḍekku. The verb uṛa has the past uṛaṇnu, uṛei - uṛenjirjuneto

p.101. The modification undergone by the vowels i & u before t, n, etc I should rather ascribe to the influence of the following vowel. It is the power of an a or its cognate sound which penetrates into the preceding syllable

p.102. the change of e into o pervades especially the Tulu - bolli ~~bigh~~ silver = velli, etc

p.102. the law of surds & sonants as stringent in Mal as in Tamil.

p.103. dantam, pampa etc can never be correctly pronounced by Malayalis, who are on this account ridiculed by Northern Brahmins. As they invariably pronounce nt = nd mp = mb, they have changed the pronunciation of Sanscrit nd mb, nj, ng etc into something like a gemination of the respective nasals (sambandhi fr. becomes sammandi), thus vitiating also the Sanscr. sonants, in order to keep up a distinction between them & the surds.

p. 105. The soft pronunciation of g true of Mal. as well.
"Tamil ச" should be written ch, on the same principle that uses ch to represent the Telugu చ. The ancient pronunciation is probably retained by the lower classes: the very soft sound, when ச is used as Initial appears to be an affectation of the higher castes.
p. 106. Initial ñj in Mal. represents an ancient y f.i. ñjān = yān ñjaṇḍu, a crab, in Can. yaṇḍri.
p. 108 irā & iravu belong, I suspect, rather to the chapter of the formation of nouns, than to that of euphonic changes (Compare uṇā & uṇavu)
ṛ is found not in Tam. "only" but in Mal., Badaga & old Canarese likewise
ḷ not "invariably" used instead of ṛ in Canarese. ṛ appears to have become r in some words (f.i. ardu wept) as is still the case in Tulu & then it was dropped as happens often to r before double consonants f.i. porṭu becomes hottu (time)

p. 109. The hard k becomes often j in Tulu f.i. Tamil kaṉṟu calf, canji in Tulu.

ii) the letter n is found in Canarese in the form ε, & of course in Mal where the old writing distinguishes it pretty correctly from the dental n. — I am not quite satisfied with the way in which this class of letters is represented. We require in fact three sets of t - d - n to represent distinctly the powers of the Tam & Mal sounds. If dots be used to distinguish the cerebrals, Greek letters might do for the sounds lying midway between the cerebrals & Dentals thus

η = C   ηη = ττ   ooi η = νδ.

In pronunciation this ττ is perhaps nearest to the English t, & it is usurped for this purpose by some learned Malayalis. I received once from Cottayam a bundle with the inscription I wonder if you can

decipher this hieroglyph

110. Is mūru more ancient than mūrdu?
Canarese dislikes the Nasals throughout (except the halfanuswara which it likes to introduce as f.i. in saiṅkya = sahya). kardu in Can. karu, which is the older? I suppose Ru in mūrdu & ordu to be the formative Du, Tu, changed by its contact with final oor (r). mun, on appear to me the original forms, the one from the radical mu = to be before, excel (whence mun & probably S. mukha, also mukku nose, & the verb mukka) the other from radical o = to be one. Many old nouns are formed with oor (as ēn what? etc.) This r changes with R, as in pin, piRa but also with r. (f.i. uḷan birth, also uḷar, uḷavu etc). Oru therefore appears to me only the more liquid equivalent of the Noun Or.

senRu or chevdu I would rather derive from chel-ndu, than seldu, as the latter would have to become seRRu.

Is nd "always found in Telugu" instead of ndr? I merely ask, but cannot

remember instances to the point. Only it strikes me that in representing the R Telugu differs systematically from Canarese. I allude to words like mātu C māṭu Tel which are the same with Tam. māRRu "answer, word". Canarese takes indeed often a Telugu word, as f.i. pattu = Tam paRRu, whilst it retains also its appropriate form hattu. Still there can be no doubt that the 2 languages follow a different course in the treatment of the double R: we should therefore expect them also to differ in their ways of using the NR.

sh is in Mal. represented by ẓ (aushadham in old Mal. aviẓdam) s mostly by t, 3 by ch & y

Mal. also destitute of h

112. l has nearly disappeared from Telugu: also Tulu changes it very often into l. Sanscrit influence has hardly caused the transition,

as Mahratte Concani & other neighbouring Arya languages use it very freely, & Sanscrit words both in Can. & Mal. have retained it unsparingly.
p. 114 g in mal. often lost, f.i. chagaḍu a cart, chāḍu
i) As in Tel. so may also in Mal. v be changed into g. f.i. chuvanna red often chuganna
ii) Tam. chīrei in Mal. kīra - a very rare change
p. 115. IV) vātil or vāḍil in Mal is but a corruption of vāyil (similar to Tulu pudar = peyar)
2. The softening of s into y is here treated as a corruption, & p. 120 ascribed to a peculiar perversity. I look upon the transition as perfectly legitimate, & suspect it will be difficult to pronounce which is in each case the original sound. If Tel. chēsi is decidedly later than chēyi, Can. pesar, kesaru etc may be dialectic forms, younger than peyar, chēṟu etc. Tam. pasi becomes in high Mal. regularly pei (in the form peidāha hunger & thirst), & peim is considered better than pasum 'green'
p. 116. Mal. can hardly be said to prefer

n to n. It arose indeed ninakku to their besides ninakku. On the other hand tuniyu, "venture", becomes tuniyu, kaṇbu, kāmbu, eṇbadu embadu &c.
ii) ettu is hardly euphonic change from eṇ, but the same formative which is added to the numerals of 1, & 2, 3, is also at work here.
peṇḍu = peṇ + du, as is shown by the other form peṇḍi, in which the formative ti is the common feminine termination.
peḍei I look upon, as formed by adding the formative ei to peḍu, which is an other form of the root peṇ, even as piḍu (whence piḍacka to be born) is another form of the root pin, or niku of nil.
117. The euphonic change of ad into an. ar is not to my taste. I believe this belongs altogether to the chapter of the inflexions, & hope there to indicate why I compare C. an to Tam. an (as fr. in [illegible], [illegible] 6)
ii) vayadu is the correct, vayasu the vulgar Tadbh. of S. vayas(u). _ But I believe

that peyar became first pesar, & then pedar, even as vāyil became in Mal vādil by passing through Tam. vāśil. Similarly kiṛecka to part, pronounced kiyecka, becomes in modern Mal kidecka. – On the other hand t passes even into s f.i. mutta old. often mussa. & low castes interchange them both ludicrously, (saying f.i. seivatte tēvicka "to serve God" instead of Deivatte sēvicka)

iii.) the change of nd into ñj after palatal vowels prominent in Mal. past tenses (aṟindu – aṟiññu, ārāyndu – ārāññu, paṟeindu – paṟeññu) p. 118 anju may still be older than the apparently more regular cindu.

iv.) tt changed into chch f.i. T. peṟuttu, old C. perchchu, mod. C. herchchu

– Add to uṇarchi also kāṭchi Mal. kāṛcha, iruḷcha, aṛalcha, pugaṛcha

write Mal chiricha instead of siricha

v.) n softened into y? Rather the reverse. (āya older than āyina, āna solli-y-a older than sollina)

vor Sanscr. yuga, yama become
in T. nugam, Naman — And a Can.
Indu corresponds with Tam & Mal
nindu to swim. Might we not rather
say, y passes into ny & n?
5.1.) Not merely initial p becomes in
Can. h (haudu "yes" from ahudu,
an old form = apu, agu "to be such".
Similar bahudu = baruvadu)
p. 119. III) "b often softened into v". Quest-
ionable, since there is a v, in Tam. extensively
used in inflexions, whilst an indepen-
dent b is wanting.
IV. "m changes into n" The termination
an is probably more than a euphonic
change of am.
120. II) pedda rather = perda, as her is in Can.
continually changed into hegg, hebb, hedd.
III) Tam & Tul. iranji Mal ilañji, Tam
pariśei M paliśa
Tel. teliyu perhaps rather from teḷi
than teri (Can tiḷi)
p. 121. chiku = chil & chin, other forms
of the same root. But par grow
looks quite distinct from per
In Mal "v is always w". I doubt it, our

ꝛ lies between those 2 Engl sounds
122. Old Canarese possesses the ṟ.
In Mal ṟ is not often converted into
ḷ rather into y as Malayāṟma often
written & spoken Malayāyma
ṟ in Tulu words generally r; f.i.
pordu time. Canarese does ~~not~~
use the same word as hottu. Mala-
yalam writes pōḷ, but merely be-
cause the sign ꝛ serves as final
ḷ & ṟ, the Dative is pōṟeckku: now
& then are written & spoken ippōṟum
appōṟum
Can. kammāran is from the Sanscr.
karmakāra (no change from ā/a)
123. anusham in Mal aniṟam. Ushayam
is in old medical works written kiṟa-
yam, Lakshmana in an old Ramay-
ana Ilaṟkkanan
sha discarded in Vishnu, Viṇṇu, Viṇ (T. & Mal)
Sushkam, chukku
sa = ta, f.i. in tei a plant from sasya
Can. sasi. discarded in sandhya, andi
(evening) etc
Śa & Śra discarded in Śrēṇi, ēṇi, Śravaṇam
Ōṇam, Jyeshtha Ēṭṭa, Śravishṭham Aviṭṭam

p. 124.1. dwanda - rather dwandwa
as also p. 103. 125
p. 128 vāndlu is probably older than
vādlu. The masculine termination
of av-an, mag-an is in Telugu cere-
bralized (ndu), even as the Rk of
the same class becomes in Tel. ṭṭ.
IV) anda inda I would not derive
from adu idu, but rather from an
old noun am, im. This with the for-
mative ku "direction" gives angu, ingu -
with the da of relative participle
the adjectives anda, inda - besides
many other formations.
maru fragrant?
131. "Originally we may be sure that
one consonant alone was used for
this purpose" Why should this be?
Labial ~~consonant~~ vowels affect as surely
the semivowel v, as palatals do
y. The question can only be how far
the use of each extend. In Mal. y
has gradually encroached upon
the domain of v, pure a having
become rare, & y being preferred after
the palatal i.

133. I doubt the derivation of T. & M. um from Tel. nu. The copulative particle would seem to be a pronominal noun: um, analogous to the am & im from which inda, angu etc are derived. The Tel. inversion of the sounds is quite of a piece with their te & to & kre & kro (for kadei & kodu) etc.

p. 134. padin hardly an example of n used for the prevention of hiatus. The numeral 10 is a very difficult one, but I doubt not that in T. "in" served for the oblique (or locative) case. padin mūndru is decisive to that effect (old Mal. padinmūnnu). Similar ombadin-āyiram, and enbadin kōḍi (in Rāmacharitam).

The proof of the original exclusive use of n appears to me far fetched. Words like a-w-an, i-w-an, with all their changes into vāndu, vēndu, prove sufficiently the original employment of v for preventing hiatus.

p. 136 In the harmonic sequence of vowels Tulu nearest to Telugu — f.i. büruduḍu, falling, has two u in consequence of the labial vowel ü in the radical syllable: jatt'ḍ', coming down, has two Shvas because the radical vowel is other than labial — patnōḍ-du from the town (u on account of ō) but maraḍ-ḍ' from the tree (Shva after a)

p. 138. med. — Tulu words terminate likewise in vowels. Mal = Tamil, but inclining rather more to the Northern way.

p 140. l. 13 from below — why "probably"?

"kudirei" from Rad. kudi to jump. In Mal. poetry this origin is well preserved f.i. In Rama Charitam kuditt-e̲rum kudira. Or the frequentative (iterative): kudi-kudichu mandunna kudiragal (Ramayanam) — Can. kudure Tul kudre agree fully (kudi in Can. to rise up).

In Comm. Mal. displacement of consonants very frequent f.i. kinaTTil in the well vulgo kiṟandil.
p. 141. navel Mal. pokkuḷ & pokkiḷ

2.) To Euphonic displacement I would add "and amalgamation" of vowels. In rōlu. f.i. I take ō to be the result of a+u (= Can. oralu & orḷu). Tel. to prob. = ula; ledu = illadu. Hina rē night = irā; lē = iḷa; vray = varei. Tulu ana bogy (as in lakku rise, leppu = Hoosgo call) would show, that this unsettledness of the vowels attaches chiefly to radicals with liquid consonants.
p. 142. rejection of liquid consonants in Can. as frequent as in Tel. eppattu = 70. ebbisu to raise, Caus. of ēlu — emme (Tel. erme) = erumei; kobbu Can. komme Tu. both fat & pride = T. koḻuppu & Tel. krovvu or kovvu. Also Tel. poddu from an older proddu. But Can. hottu from a.c. poṟtu. (Tu. portu). — medicine Tu. & a.c. mardu mod. C. maddu: thus showing a tendency

to reject the nasal of Tam & Tel.

p. 142. ōḍu is the lengthening (= Verbal Noun) of oḍu which is still used even in Mal. poetry. Old Can. has oḍa, oḍam, Tul. oḍugu, new Can. oḍane (= Tam. uḍan) Surely this root is sufficiently established to need no explanation from tōra whose radical is toṛu (as in toṛil). — tuḍar is better toḍar & explains itself as toḍu (contact) with the ar of Verbal Nouns. — These 3 roots I take to be altogether distinct from eachother.

"the first syllable" remaining "always unchanged" ought to warn us against identifying tōra with oḍu, āl with kēl, as also against the very questionable associations of iḍi, aḍi, oḍi etc (p. 163)

p. 145. 3.) particles? rather pronominal roots

p. 145. 1. Verbal themes ought to be kept more distinct from the Verbal roots, than is the case. karei, alei appear to me Verbal nouns, but rather

secondary verbal themes than roots.
p. 47. vir̤al & viri both from a root vir. – kaḍal perhaps as well as kaḍan, kaḍei etc from kaḍu. – kuḍal from kuḍu whence also kuḍi, kūḍu. – kur̤al perfectly distinct (Can. & Tul kolal) = kur̤ei what is hollow, from kur̤ whence kuri etc. – Vir̤al I would not call a Verb. N. of the lost root vir̤ – chēyal in Mal. the breeding of fowls cheekku the place of roosting & breeding (Tam. cheeka strawbed) I would derive from an old root chē, (a. C. ~~ಕೆ~~ kē, lie down to embrace sexually)
māḍu perhaps from mā the strong (beast) with formative ḍu. māḍu at all events secondary Verb from maḍu (Tulu mal.)
– āḍu I call a Verb. Noun from aḍu, to fight, kill & cook, whether it signify that mutton was the old food of the Dravidas (as prob. of the Brahuis), or what I prefer, that the goats are considered as fighting together (aḍu to approach in combat, hence aḍal).
The (secondary) Verb āḍu I would then derive from the Noun: frisking like a goat etc
"muga" in Can nose. There is no Verb mugu

a mell, but mugu Tul, muchchu Tel muggu Can. (T. & mal. mugar) these are certainly related. I would rather derive it (together with mukham) from mu "prominence", whence mugar & mugal = mukham.
Strange that kir is called underived, whereas p. 157 its root kir & some derivatives are mentioned. kir is in fact the verb. Noun of kir
mel is no doubt = mi-y-al Verb Noun of mi "to be above", whence midu, Tul midda etc. In Can. myēlē is still written
Vin = Vishnu
"Nouns of quality" rather verbs of quality.
"mun" undoubtedly verb. Noun of mu - with the formative N.
p. 148. āl = āgal Inf of āgu. The meaning would be "being for it" or "being along with it". I prefer the latter on account of the Tulu lā which no doubt is = Tam & Mal. āl, & serves at present in all the significations of um. The 3d case would thus rather be

a Social in its original import, than an Instrumental. (for Tulu compare: in Lord's prayer rājyatā trānatā mahimetā yēnēnigatā ninān ādundu – in Imper. bal-tā = [illegible])
"kāl" serves for the Locativ. & is for this purpose by Mal. shortened ~~to~~ "kal".
"the copulativ particle" shows its origin from pron. root u. Um corresponds with Am, Im in angu etc
"gik" in T. I should separate k – inku – & take the latter in its original sense of today now.
"ku" a formativ, signifying direction (angu – vadakku, mērku etc)
p. 149. Dravidian roots are certainly monosyllabic, of 2 classes, ending in a vowel, which may be long (ā – chā – mī – pō –) or ending in a consonant, in which case the radial vowel is short – aḍ – an – kuḍ – Lingual Consonants are regularly interchanged as ~~[illegible]~~ ḍu = l (nīḍu = nīḷ) ḍu = ṇ (naḍu, naṇ) l = ṟu (nil, niṟu – nal, naṟu) n = ḍu (purḍu purn – perhaps murḍu, murn: but

here already formatives & secondary verbal themes may be suspected)
p. 150. "Euphonic lengthening" to me very doubtful. I derive viral, virei, viri from vir, & suppose that the Verb-nouns derived from the root become the themes of secondary Verbs.
"the best proof" appears to me no proof at all.
p. 151 Why suppose an original tri or vri in opposition to the principles of syllabation as p. 138. A root tir answers all purposes (tirei, tiral, tiri, tirugu, tirumb etc are easily derived from it, & the different dialects even Telugu itself agree - compare Tel. tirugu, tirigali tiripe, tirlika etc)
the "second mode" is not much better than the first. Too much is explained by euphony. The statement of p. 160 & 161 is much more to the purpose. But in i, a, ei I see vocal formatives, still discoverable in Verbal Nouns (padi, padei, pādu V. N. or derivatives from padu). U alone I take to be

a euphonic vowel (as in adu). The other auxiliary vowels as they are called, are not "all interchangeable", but the different dialects prefer the one or the other formative. One Canarese dialect likes nade, the other nadi - T & Mal prefer pure nada for walking but the root is no doubt nadu (to plant? eater?) - "T. mulei" is thus from "mul" to come forth, itself a Noun "a protrusion, thorn" & derivative from mu.

p. 152. With the "formative Additions" I can better agree, but would call "gu" etc in the first place Verbal Nouns.

p. 153. No doubt the "original distinctive meaning" of many of these formatives is lost. In some it may be discovered fr. minunga as distinguished from minnu appears to be a frequentative (so the verbal adverbs valingana, cherunga na, at a great rate, small rate) - Iteratives or descriptives like veluvelucka - kiku kikucka - nukunukungu etc might also be mentioned here

p. 154 Tel. pen = Tam. per (hence pedda)

p. 155. tūngu from old tu (whence tuyil)
p. 156. Ūl appavi surely not = Tam oppuvi?
p 157. why again return to "considerations of euphony"?
"vambu" from vei? or = vanbu (as in Mal) — "Canarese vayyu" rather bei bayyu)
"parandu" rather from spreading wings (to fly paṛ, not par)
p. 158. "euphonic additions"? doubtful. "formative particles" true; but how are they to be distinguished from the Particles of specialisation?
"aḍar" f.i. is = chudar a Verbal Noun. In Mal ular-āga, ulan-āga are poëtical synonymes of ulaw-āga "being born". —
p. 161. "Not the only purpose for which these vowel additions are used" is euphony: why not rather then assume, that at first they had always a meaning, which they still retain in some cases, but lost in others.
p. 162. It is a mistake to call valar (f.i.) a root. It is a noun to all intents &

purposes, & becomes again a Verbal theme — "mugaku" in Mal = mugam face. — "il" a real compound veyil, that wherein heat lodges, kudil that wherein one lives together. — "ul" the same, arul fr. the Verb-Noun of "aru" previous porul of poru —

vilei, Can. bele signifies, I believe, to grow white (vil = vel)

p. 163. the comparison of idi, adi, odi very venturesome & opposed to the "rigidity & persistency characteristic of the Dravidian roots p. 164" —

p. 164. eddu etc see to p. 142. belongs to the nature of the liquid Consonants.

"vandu" from a double root vā or var, tā or tar

p. 166 the change of per kār, ār chiefly in combinations before vowels: but originally a Verbal Noun. kār in Mal cloud. — pār from par (whence Mal patude "in vain", paludu "void, interstice) — para "old" another derivative of the same root

"wholly euphonic" why again? It is a form of the Verbal Noun.

p. 167 "not to grammatical relation but" this is not at all obvious. Every Noun in Dravid. languages may serve as adjective: any verbal root may even without change be used as Noun (fr. chol - say - word). Still this difference, of the short vowel belonging rather to the Verb, the long to the Noun, remains unshaken (naḍu to plant - nāḍu, kaḍu be rough - kāḍu etc)

p. 167. 1) I doubt the length of the "rootvowel" in the numerals, if not in the pronoun. The numerals (being probably Verbal Nouns) can hardly be treated as roots.

p. 168. A further instance of the shortvowelled preterite is chattu

p. 173. write "peidal" rather than peital

p. 177. ān deserves hardly the name of a corruption, it being the older contraction of a + an. whereas in the more modern ōn the v of avan, however meaningless, is likewise represented

p. 177. Telugu ḍu is certainly identical with Tamil ṉ, but should not the Nasal that precedes the ḍu be duly expressed? ⁿḍu is then like Canarese ṇu, Tam. ṉ: and the expression of this Tamil ṉ (ன) by a Telugu Cerebral has its analogy in Ta. ṟṟ becoming in Telugu ṭṭ (~~whereas~~ in Can. tt), our ṉ and ṟ both belonging to the same organ.

p. 178. I can~~t~~ not identify an with ān: for the an in payan, balan (Tam) mrānu (Tel.) etc is hardly different from the Masculine formative, though freely used in neutres (as observed p. 207)

p. 179. illāl "she of the house" - no euphonic lengthening, rather composition of il with the pronoun (p. 177)

p. 180. I have no doubt of the identity of Tam. āl & Tel. ālu

p. 182. Mal ata, ita: rather ad", id".

p.188. middle english has the plur. brethern, anglosaxon merely brôdhra. Dutch uses now both broeders & broederen, middle Dutch preferred the first form.
p.189 Is not makkal properly speaking the plural of magu, a neuter?
- Mal. has the plural magalar for daughters (only in poëtry)
p.190. "the same practice adopted in Canarese".! Hardly. Even in Mal. avar is constantly used for the real plural, avargal is rather a honorific singular (f.i. Sahibavargal). Can. avaru is real plural: atanu is looked upon as the honorific singular, though avaru is likewise used for it. ningal in Mal both plur & honorif. singular as never in Can.
p.190.1. Tulu. er' or era - Tam. plurals ār & ōr not merely euphonic mutations from ar, but contracted plurals of 3d pers. pronoun. The same is the origin of mār.
p.191 I suppose it identical with Telugu vāru, & to have

been originally joined to the termina-
tion an: thus purushanvar became
purushanmar (as Mal. & a.T.
kaṇvan "about to see" kaṇman).
p.192. eṇ-mar poët = eṇ-var; rather
of future origin, than pronominal?
In Mal. ~~or~~ vāṛvavan, vaṛvon of
the future relat. participle becomes
often vaṛuvan. Thus uṇmōr
(& uṇmar, which yet I have not
yet met with) = eaters.
Pronominal v is however a very
comon formative in Mal. &
I think it deserves being recorded
in connection with mar. We say
not merely viṇṇavar, vānuvar
(contracted viṇṇōr, old viṇṇar)
for "those in heaven, celestials"
but also Īravar = Ceylonese from Īram,
& with Sanscrit words mūrkha-
var, uragavar, kumbhimukha-
van etc, in comon life kāraṇavar

the head of the household, mother's brother, anantaravar descendants heirs etc

p. 193 "nu becomes ū! I doubt it strongly

p. 193. enmanār appears to me a free composition of the singular an with a plural pronoun ār. Similar to the honorific use of ār (= avar) in Bhagavānār, Dēviyār, modern Rājāv-avargaḷ

p. 194. "In Mal" gaḷ or kaḷ

p. 195 In Tulu kuḷu (not kulu) f.i.: ākuḷu they, nikuḷu you, enkuḷu we

p. 196. τ older than k? a delicate question, particularly in Greek, where τις etc is newer than quis, (Sanscr. kas)

197. ell connected with all? I suggest that ellām contains a negative a, & the original meaning is "boundless, unlimited" The positive el as in elgei

p. 198 also in Mal. pala, chila are neutre plurals, used in poetry — now commonly palavu, chilavu

p. 199. why is not Tam. ivei, avei mentioned, as the transition from Mal. iva, ava to Telugu ivi avi. As in illei, Mal. & Can. illa, final a lapses easily into a palatal sound

p. 200 Tulu avu, rather a-u (v is not written), as I believe, merely a corruption from adu. The form used for yes is and' (not atu), which appears to be am, the same from which angu is formed, with the old neutre termination du.*) That tu existed formerly in Tulu, is plain enough: f.i. att' is the word used for no, & is evidently = al-tu, as ijji "not existing" is = il-tu, iRRu; onji = Can. ondu one etc

p. 204 "peyrê" — rather peyarē

*) and' has quite the meaning of Mal adé lit. that very thing = yes. Its form is the same as of ind', which is = Tam. idu, & of undu = T. udu

p. 204 The neuter termination am signifies probably "it".
Modern Canarese has the termination am in the form avu. Occasionally am occurs in compositions of nouns with verbs, as kada kollu to borrow, also kadam gollu. Also compounds like angei (Can. & Tulu) = Tam. & Mal. agangei, from agam inside, may here be taken into consideration

207 "in" appears to me identical with il, house, place, (compare the conditionals agin - āgil) the oblique cases would all seem to be modifications of the Locative, as expressing something happening in or about the noun, whilst the Nominative pronounces its totality. In Mal. the postposition il is rarely found following in: forms like guruvinil, mātāvinil occur only in pedantic poetry (whilst guruvināl, guruvinkal etc are quite common).

p. 209. Can. ad & ar I cannot consider as identical. ad agrees fully with attr. of Tam & Mal. & is I have also no doubt identical with the neuter demonstrative adu.
"Tulu ad" not quite exactly "used where Canarese uses ar" – f.i. Bhūmida mitt' upon the earth. padike-d-ākulu "those who are of the evil, or in the evil = the wicked" so paṭna-d-ākuḷu etc for citizens
Can. ar is I believe = aṟ; but not by dialectic change from ad, rather instead of an (as p. 207) which even in Tam. can become (~~adaṟ-ku~~ aṟ (before sounds, as adaṟku), & becomes such easily in Can. because of its dislike of Nasal combinations
p. 210. Tel. ṭi appears to me = Tam ṟṟu; that is the produce of ṟt & ṟt. – tolli corresponds with Tam Mal. tol, & is therefore differently treated

p. 212 ellāw-um occurs in old Mal & the neutr. plur. ellāvu corresponds evidently with the 2 others pala-vu chila-vu

aRRu I take to arise from the combination an-ttu, & to favor my derivation of Can. ar. Tel. ti agrees with it, as organically representing RR

p. 216. Mal enikk" & inikk", also (poët) en-akk" — to thee ~~ni~~ ninakk" or ninakk". — remark namukk" (~~rarely~~ old namakk"), with which a rarely used tamukk" corresponds.

nāleikku in Mal nālekk" chiefly temporal affix, f.i. āṇḍekku to the year, ennekkum forever

p. 218. old Mal accusative often merely a palatal a (thus vāna chumanta mala in Ram Charit! ē is another form of this Mal. expression of the eikaram

p. 219. vinnu from Vishnu shortened to vin, as kaumam (kammu) to kam.

p. 219 Tulu Acc. n' – observe the preceding e, which is certainly = Can. a (f.i. und-en' = idei Tam. idannu Can.) in plur. kāryoḷen' = kāryangaḷei, kāryagaḷannu). In words like satyan' yanan' = satyavannu, nannanau the Accus. termination may lay as much claim to the preceding a, as the stem of the noun. Plur. Accusatives like pātera occuras in Canarese.

p. 220. I believe likewise the Can. & Tel. Accusatives to be identical, & this old am to be the same which forms so many neuter nouns viz an old nomen am or an = ādu (the like of which survives in the Interrogative noun ēn)

p. 220 the Tulu accusatives are yanan' me ninan' thee

p. 222. "in" or "im" no doubt originally locative: the signification of motion as in Tam. Ablative appears secondary.

Tulu ḍ'da consists probably of a Locative noun ẹ̄ḍe = iḍei, or oḍu & the general oblique case in da, which also appears in the Cana-rese compound "in-da"

āl, ān no doubt Verbal Nouns of āgu, & signifying: "being also there." — (I doubt if there is a Bengalee kāl Channel)

p. 223. Various adverbial participles may serve instead of the Instru-mental in Mal. fi. knowing doing seeing considering, putting saying etc

p. 223. Is the case not rather this, ~~that~~ the Sanscrit Instrumental is also a Social, than ~~that~~ the latter is unknown to Sanscrit? Tam. Mal āl - conḍu - oḍu are the different ~~trans~~ renderings or equivalents of the 3d Sanscrit case. But I quite agree that the ~~Mal.~~ Dravi-

dian list of cases ought to be differently arranged. first the Nomin then the Inflexion then the Locative etc. The Dative f.i. ought to follow the ~~latter~~ Locative as we have many locative Datives (allige Can. thither, ūril-e-kku into the town Mal. etc)

p.224 ōḍu is probably older than ōḍu, in Mal. it is still used as a mere Locative noun f.i. ang-ōḍu thither. - ōḍu pronounce in Mal ōḍu, not ōṭa. - The necessity for identifying oḍu with toḍ I cannot understand. Why should not oḍu signify junction in a place, union, if the derived ottu has the same meaning in Tam. Can. Tulu. ~~Tel~~ The ~~post~~positions may be freely chosen in the different dialects - even as Tam. & Mal prefer it for the Locative whilst Tel. & Tulu affect rather ul,

without obliging us in the least to try & identify it with ul, which might be done with even less expense of ingenuity
todar with todangu belongs alto-gether to the derivations from tod to touch
225. Mal. Dat. kk^{u} Tul k^{i} g^{i}
227 again Mal. nanikka, instead of ninakk^{u} Tul. nikk^{i}. In old Mal. you meet with ulagukku vēndanick^{u}tanayanicku (Ram Char) & mū-v-ulagickum: in modern Mal with onnuck^{u} besides onni-nn^{u}. innu cannot be derived from inku, which in Mal would become ilku & finally icku (as kōyilk^{u}, kōyilkal - kōyickal, vādilkal at the door ~~a~~ vādickal & now vādukkal). I would deri-ve it from the Genitive. enre my is evidently to be resolved into en-adu-e. marattinre =

marattin-ad^u. The Dative marattinnu I consider as softened from marattinku even as ninnu, innu from T. ninku, inku. The Sanscrit Dative is in Mal versions rendered by āykondu & other strengthenings of the Dravidian Dative, whilst the Sanscr. Genitive is continually rendered by ku (f.i. tēshām asti = averkku undu). I therefore assume that in this form of the Dative we have a relic of the Genitive. Only one circumstance makes me doubtful. Simple nu is as common in the old Mal as double nnu – f.i. nagarkkum nāttinum in Rāma Charitam – nāyinu coduttu (Panchatantr = nāykku) – magan^u = magannu – jaṭāyū-nu mōxam nalgi etc. In the dativ of the mascul. termination it is still most common (avanu to him etc). Here it might be most probable that ku has been simply

dropped. Musulmans who in various points, as f.: in their Mal. alphabet & in the discarding of Aspirates etc., hold fast antiquated forms, will generally say Sultānikku, other castes Sultānu.

p. 229. I doubt "in" being originally a genitive suffix, but agree to its being locative

atti_itti_ stand probably for a-il, i-il, as haudu does for ahudu, hāge & hīge for ā bage, ī bage (= vagei Tam.)

p. 231. en, nin I consider as a Composition case, rather than as Adjective. The 5th form of the Genitive (p. 240) should I conceive monopolize whatever of Adjective Character can belong to a Dravidian case

p. 231.2. attu having still such decided locative power proves to me that the Composition case partakes rather of locative than of possessive Character (kulattu mīn fish in the tank _ Mal. ivid attu vaanu came here

avidatt-ān he who is in that place)
p. 233 maramadu appears to me likewise adjutivic or appositional. In Mal poetry we continually meet with adu porudu = appos. Therefore adu = a
3., the use of adu common in old Mal Antakan adu chinam etc in Ram. Char. In modern usage scarcely beyond tanadu & perhaps enadu (whence tanRe, enRe)
p. 237. an_am appear to me the same formatives of pronominal offspring as f.i. in ad_aR-ku
p. 245. ute, better uḍe Mal - mine enRé-du - Tulu ta_da I look upon as originally rather locative & composition_form
p. 246. udaya occasionally used in Mal - uḍe still farther mutilated in modern poetry & prose (Sītede of Sita, putrū-ḍe of the daughter)
p. 247 N.B. Is il = not? Perhaps rather = ul, undu: & the negative power rests in (ill-a) the closing a, however

much ~~this~~ usage may have dispensed with it (in inAi T. ippi Tel. etc) Even as in french pas personne have become Negatives by mere association (in German – kein)

p. 247. alli – illi – adverbs of place? hardly as the Dative allige, alliada etc show

p. 248 Tel andu, indu I would compare to the Tulu demonstr. neuters and' ind' undu & call them nouns rather than adverbs

p. 248 " The locative is more likely to be derived from the genitive than " – I doubt it. The different contrivances employed to obtain a Dravidian Genitive go far to show that originally its want was not felt; a Composition form with Locative meaning, judicious employment of the Dative etc would suffice instead. In Mal & Tam it is felt difficult to combine two possessives with um. Old Mal. eschews

this constantly (f. i.: രാമനും കാർവർണ്ണനും [illegible] വചനം = in the mouths of Rama & of Krishna –). In modern poëtry Sanscrit analogy has conquered, as foreign influence has done in prose (ivankeyum avankeyum kūdikāẓcha – their interview). Still there is no real case which has to struggle with this difficulty.

p. 249. The Tulu Locative is not mentioned, but would require elucidation.

It is possible that in tōkoḍu, ākāȝoḍu – o is the result of a + u (assuming uḍu to be like uḷ T. ūḍu Mal. T.) – or of a + i (ne) with a v to serve against hiatus (when iḍei, ede would suggest a suitable noun of place). But oḍu, as treated in my remarks on the Tam & Mal Social or conjunctive case, might also ~~well~~ be supposed to survive here; however ~~lost~~ much after other terminations (ādi ~~ᾱre~~ ḍ', kattale ḍ', āyaḍ' in him plur. keiled' etc in the hands) the initial vowel may be obliterated.

Forms like dinōṭu keiṭ' in the hand, suggest rather Telugu analogies.

The Local Dative ~~va~~ âdilku – ~~va~~ âdil-ēcku in Mal – ittinādeg' Tulu (= to the place where is) etc appears nowhere mentioned (p. 250)

p. 249. Vocative in Mal – often formed by lengthening a closing vowel (tōzī o female friend. arachā o king – (old poët) virāyō o hero) besides many Sanscrit forms even in Dravidian words f.i. tatté o parrot, ammé o mother = S. priyē fem

p. 250. In Mal. [illegible] locative – directive or [illegible] into the land [illegible] does hardly belong to this chapter, ഉൾ signifying in this case rather "to be within" (whence ഉള്ള) The old form is [illegible], [illegible]

The Ablative is often found contracted f.i. [illegible] from the Cammālar

p 252. Compound nouns are surely not contrary to the original genius of Indo European languages, nor are ~~they~~ the result of a process of corrup

tion. goldwatch and other English Compounds are only the result of carrying that liberty to its utmost limit which from the ~~olden~~ first age of the language ~~[illegible]~~ allowed of compounds like goldfät (anglosaxon) The fact is only that we have two forms, where the Dravidian language must be content with one.

p. 253. 2. "imitation of Sanscrit Derivatives?" If such be the case it extends certainly not only to the am, but also the an & ar terminations (maraCkalam, kaṭṭalapati, māramāl).

3. Instead of calling ത്തു adjectivic I would rather give it a Locative meaning. ഏലത്തരി the grain in the Cardamom വലത്തുഭാഗം. the side which is on the right [illegible] an elephant in the jungle കാട്ടാന [illegible] the Island Ceylon [illegible]

p.254 [illegible], [illegible], [illegible], [illegible] are some of the few Mal. instances that survive. കുരക്കൂട്ടം, monkey army" is an instance of the change of ngu into kku.

ത്തു fr. [illegible] often pronounced & written — [illegible]

[illegible] — [illegible] — [illegible] — [illegible]

[illegible] — [illegible] (a Name of Malabar)

[illegible] — [illegible] — [illegible]

[illegible] — [illegible] — [illegible]

An adverbial as very common

[illegible] - [illegible] -

adjective രാവിലെത്തെ [illegible] (breakfast) - [illegible] a fowl's breastbone - ~~without~~ Locative

[illegible]

Nouns [illegible] & [illegible]

[illegible] - [illegible] - [illegible] -

[illegible] - [illegible], [illegible]

[illegible]

p. 256. A second future [illegible] (is good) [illegible], [illegible] exists still in Mal

p. 257 In Mal. [illegible], വലിയ, [illegible], [illegible], [illegible], പുതിയ - [illegible] - [illegible] - also [illegible] & [illegible] (though now called Sanscrit)

[illegible] - [illegible] - [illegible] - [illegible] - [illegible] - [illegible] without the mark of the past tense

p. 260. Comparison common in Mal. poetry [illegible] - [illegible], [illegible] - also [illegible] - [illegible] etc

p. 262. In Canar. ondu kei one hand, obba maganu one son.

p. 264 Mal onnu

p. 265 Mal mūnnu

p. 265 I take both ol & on to be Verbal Nouns of the root "o" to be one (as uḷar = uḷan or uḷavu)

oRRei I derive from ഒന്റു as āṭṭei from āṇḍu (cf. in āṭṭackanni a cow which has every year a calf)

p. 267 Tel. oka is no doubt = Mal. ഒക്ക to be one, which means "all" when ഉം or -ഏ are joined to it – we use ഒന്നു, ഒരുമിച്ചു, ഒക്ക കൂടെ interchangeably with ഒടു e.g. after the Social case

p. 268 Tel. rendu has re for ira old Mal. has iraṇḍu (esp. compare ഇരുപതു 12) – root the same as in iruḷ, irā, īra (to saw)

p. 271 mū or mu "to be before" might be used to strengthen the defence of holy numbers (as also ēḍu 7 signifies eminence, majesty)

Tel. mūḍu = Tam. mūn (as vāṇḍu = avan) Can. mūru shortened from mūnRu according to constant analogy. j in Tulu mūji is the representative of R.

The formative tu discoverable in onRu, iraṇḍu, mūnRu

p. 274 In Tulu padinal = 14, padinaji = 16

p. 275. I consider it not quite proved that ein-du is Dravidian – at least I know nothing of a Radical "ei." Can. Panchu "to divide" together with the Analogies of S. pancha & amsa looks tempting. A grammatically correct ~~form~~ eindu might also have been formed afterwards as peim was from pasum. Anju is ~~also~~ found in T. poetry & therefore not mere corruption – At all events I would prefer eim by far to an original eid. (compare [illegible] = [illegible]) – du would be the same formative as in the 2 first Numerals.

p. 277 I doubt whether the process of softening away the initial consonant is so very common.

As regards [illegible] the question is only whether it be not derived from the Number, signifying a fiveness, fist, handful

p. 278 aṟu to cut, go in pieces
eẓu eminence – The short form original, the lengthened form constitutes the Noun, as the addition of du does in other cases

p. 279. en "<u>the</u> number" probably in
the same sense, in which ashta at one time
closed the list of Arya Numerals, so that
navam, when added afterwards, could
be called the new number.
p. 285 I take ombadu (with the Tulu wormb)
to be quite distinct from tol, although
the significations of both additions have
similar meaning. Ombadu one to ten
as padinon is one after ten. Tol = before,
the number before ten, whence
tonḍu 9, as it were the number preceding
10, or the foremost, highest number
among the units.
The euphonical change p. 284 is not
proved (nanbu from root naṇ to love
remember in Mal, to be close in Tam.,
certainly cognate with naṭ & nadu, but
not ~~deriv~~ so that ṇbu be a derivation
from ṭbu)
p. 286 nadu "oldest extant form"? I
doubt it. I am half inclined to derive
it from paṅkti, tadbh pandi - which
survives fr. in pantirandu. Compare
Compounds like panktisyandana
Dasamukha. Both five and

ten might possibly be derived from the same root panch. N is naturally thrown out in Canarese on account of its aversion to nasal combinations. But in hanneradu C pannerdu Tulu etc the old nasal is still found. ~~Still~~ It is however hazardous to be positive on this queer word.

p. 287. Erratum micku for Nikku. Take nikku to mean powder, as signifying what is innumerable

p. 287. mudal & mun both 1 Nouns of the root mu to be before (whence also mukham face)

p. 293. I prefer the radical yān, yan to nā, & would assume that ē - e are only other forms of yā, ya as is the case in the interrogative Pronoun. If Yanna becomes in Tamil successively Enna Gnyanna & Nanna, why should not the Mal. Gayān be supposed to be also an intermediate step between original Yān & subsequent Nān. N is a very infirm

Consonant & often replaces y (as in katina - kadiya). Any how I think the statement p 294 that y evinces no tendency to be changed into n, to be untenable. (nandu T. gnyandu a T. & Mal. from Tel & Can. Tel. endri, yandri, also edi (Can.) [Telugu script] from yuga -- nendu to swim, Tel. nyanda (Can. eju, ichu)

p. 294. Tulu inflexion yan' short

p. 301 I cannot consider na or yan to be connected with Indo European ma. Telugu memu follows easily enough out of nemu. The repetition of final n in nin and tan should warn us lest we lay too much stress on this consonant. I think in fact that ye, ye is the only essential part of this pronoun, as i is of the 2d person, & ta of the 3d

307. the um of the Imperative plural I consider to be ~~nothing else~~ but the comon Particle um, (and-

also), to which in Tulu lā corresponds most regularly. Hence Tulu korlā is altogether = kodum in Tamil. The explanation of the pronominal plurals given p. 329 is supported by this fact.

p. 308. Mal Dat. [illegible], [illegible]

p. 310. Comparing the two first persons with the Demonstrative radicals a & i, has especially this objection that in Dravidian usage i as the nearer is constantly used for I, a for thou, you (cfr: iddēham Mal = I, angu = thou, honorific)

p. 324. min in kēnmin (lit. kelp-in) I consider as euphonic change from vin still used in Malayalam. The same as the plural termination mār from vār (Tel vāru). The v of this vin I take to belong to the 2d future, and in to be an abbreviation of īm.

p. 326. The long forms of the Plural Nominatives are still extensively used in Mal. chiefly with an honorific

[illegible]
p. 333. ata – ita Mal ada, ida
p. 334. Tulu anda used for yes (so it is)
p. 346. Tulu wō ought to be explained
I take it for a euphonic change
of ēva f.i. vōlu where = e-v-ulu.
Strange that mūlu "here" corre-
sponds with this vōlu. Does it
stand for ivulu (aulu is there)
passing into vyulu, the vy re-
solved into a m?
p. 347. Tulu has the interrogative
ā which in Mal. & Can. is hardly
known. In fact I have never
found interrogative ā in Mal,
though an interjectional use
of it may be found in adā
(look there! behold). The state-
ment of all Dravid. langua-
ges using the same ā is therefore
too broad.
353. Dravidian Verb not "early" compound-
ed with prepositions, but only with
Nouns, mēl ~~(miyyal)~~ being a Verbal Noun.

359. Double Accusatives not uncommon in Mal (ninne gnyān iratkuanu sāpa moxatte — mantram avane grahippichchu — avane yama lokam pugichchu etc)

p. 368 Mal has formed a whole Negative verb with 3 tenses f. i. pōgā-y-innu I go not pōgāgnyu went not pōgāyum will not go — The past verb. Participle with the Conditional is often used (pōgāgnyu he not having gone, pōgāgnyāl if not go ~~etc~~ pōgāyygilum tho' he do not go etc)

p. 374. il = ul, al I suppose = ā āgu — atkigilūr is a compound = arigailūr, māRRalan the enemy (T. & Mal) = māRRa-alan he who is not to be changed. So is the whole Negat. voice of the Tulu but the produce of ijji being inserted between stem & personal terminations. But the real Negative form ~~it I suppose is no~~ notably can hardly be the corruption of in its expression

a compound. Neither does al appear to be a negative in itself but only with the addition of the Negative a (ala, alla - even as illa, illei). I believe the pronoun a forms the negative verb, conveying the idea of a remote action - just as this ā in its interjectional form has the signification of question (& consequently of negation adu varumnā, will it come? - it will never happen).

How is the Brahui Negative -f- to be explained? Can it be a v euphonically inserted to keep a former a distinct from neighbouring vowels?

p. 375. In Mal. only adiyen, pl. adiyangal I thy servant (old Mal. ellirum yenll)

p. 382. Nag akkunn-undu rather affirmative

p. 383. Mal. has two Verbal participles the past & future

p. 388. Is not ikku the original form added to the future of the verb to signify "today, now"?

p. 389 unnu, in old Mal. continually innu, esp. in the Negative Verb (varāyinnu "comes not" etc)

p. 390 mūru tan. very doubtful example. On the contrary Mal. nānu seems to me to prove the modern corruption of Tamil ikku for ikku

p. 398. y changed into n – may be as true as the contrary case. I consider [illegible], [illegible] as older than [illegible], [illegible]

p. 400. In fact the present mode of writing [illegible] (Verb Part) [illegible] as if it were the Relat. Part. is a blemish in Mal. Orthography which ought to be systematically altered (I would propose n s m̊, as is written in No. Malabar)

p. 403. The Tulu past tense requires a particular study. āyer = [illegible] ?

but ~~a~~ ād" = [Tamil]. poyer - [Tamil]
but podu - [Tamil]. bududu - [Tamil]
batt'd' - [Tamil], but budiye - [Tamil]
[Tamil] batte [Tamil]. Therefore
~~[Tamil]~~ i of great extent in finite verb
(nearly like Telugu) - the ~~adopted~~ for
the Verb-Participle.
"i of secondary origin". Tulu at least
is not in favor of this view. I take
i to be ~~nearly~~ as old as d. Agi, poyi
are even older than Tulu podu,
in which I see only a tendency
to ~~equ~~ have a separate ~~fine~~ ~~appropriate~~ ~~one~~ each forms for
~~one~~ each meaning.
p. 408 irippān in Mal. Verb Participle,
not Infinitive. The Infinitive is iri-
cka. In Mal. Syntax the domains
of the Verb-Participle & of the
Infinitive border indeed very close-
ly on each other f.i. you can say
cheydu todangi, (cheyya tudangi - only in po)
cheyvān tudangi, with but little
diversity of meaning.
p. 409 the second future not merely

in poëtry - āvu f.i. very common & used a little differently from āgum, ām - this 2d future is likewise used as a relative participle (f.i. āvōlam, marippōlam till it be come - die)
p. 413. like maduva Can. a Malayal rel. part fut. vēnduva
p. 415 why not derive a from the demonstrate root. the āsip appōl & cheyda-ppōl do not seem to be at all different.
p. 415. Tulu not merely ti (āyi = [illegible]) tiri = [illegible]) - The present tense similar to the Behistun cal Part. pi similar to the present tense particle. - But the Tulu present tense hardly appears, the description of its parts, derived from the future (malpe I shall do, malpuve I do) another reason for accepting only 2 original tenses in the Dravid. languages (malpe fut, malte past) & explaining the present as a secondary form or modification of the future.
p. 416 re I suppose shortened from are
Can. bandare = Mal vanna-v-ārke or vannāke

= in the way of [illegible] — when he has [illegible] Can. comes to shorten [illegible]

p. 419. kal. take in the sense of place, spot (mainly as seen in angāḍi (angaḍi?) village & other adverbs ~~from āga~~ compsd with āga & corresponding with others ending in ne (from ane ena = āga)) as in oru-kāl "one spot," & in the Mal Locative kal. All locative nouns when generalized may serve for temporals — as il, idei etc

āl I have hardly any doubt is (ā-al āgal) which in ~~Telugu~~ Can. esp. is used for temporal precedence & condition.

421. I doubt whether the Imperative can be called a noun — since it is the most active part of the verb, whilst nouns are more or less the origin ~~form~~ which an action rests, or the result which it produces. The prop taken from the 2d plur. kedum is at least weakened by what I remarked to p. 307. Why should not the future (ambiguous kedum) be also the root of the Imperative as in [illegible]

422. There is an Inf. in Mal, the same as in T. only its use more restricted. (f.i. cheyya venam must do)

p. 434. Mal. pugarcha leans rather to the Can termination te (hogalte) than to the Tam. ti

p. 434. Can has also pu besides vu (bidupu & biduvu the first heard in Tulu)

p. 442 kāv-eri why not from
kā, kāvu
kāche from .. kucha (ʼkontu) &
chuchuka, hardly Dravid.
p. 443. kulam rather from cul
a cortness, kulits cortonesy
p. 444 nīr probably Mal. Noun
of niru to be level
p. 447. add rātri from irā (root
iru, whence iru-l etc)
p. 455. ella – Is the a Euphonic
or not rather negative to
signify what is unbounded?
Then the analogies exist only
in appearance
p. 456 kan. is found in Sanscrit
- kānah oneeyed, which is Beng.
becomes kānā blind. Is the
former already a semi-
negative? or does it mean
one who can still see? The
latter must nearly be a
Dravidian Negative

p 457. kiramei = what is under
goes down. kirawan one who
sinks. In Mal. ārcha is used
just like kiramei (ñāyar-
ārcha Sunday) a day of the
week & subsequently a
week. But the original mean
ing can only be: Sunset.
If kiramei means possession
it means only, what is under you.
p 458. sack. no doubt Phoenician
& therefore an imported mer
cantile term
p 459. shāttu = chār-tu & there
fore hardly to be compared
to Shut
p. 459. tagu = δεκ? But this is
plainly = Sans. diś ([illegible]-
upadeśa). Rather compare
German taugen, Goth. dugan, Tugend, Engl
Doughty (G. tüchtig)
p 60. Inspecto sufficiently explained
by dvara Sansc. Even another

Sansk. derivation, though it would offend against the character of the consonants, is in my opinion preferable to the Dravidian etymology (I mean tiras, trans, durch, through)

p. 463 pampu. Telugu initials are difficult to be trusted. Anuppu is plainly = Tel. anuchu Can. enisu, & means make to say. But if panuchu be compared, pampu may like it be the Causal of pan, which in Tulu means to say to tell.

par - plainly only one root to grow ripe, old.

p. 466. pey, Tadbh. of pisācha = pyāy

Engl. fay fr. fée - Lat. fatum Ital. fata (personified)

peyan peidal the fresh one
from the root pas, pei
pucer rather from putra
by a difficult word, not found
in Anglosax. Goth. or Oldgerman.
Germ. Bube, Bue perhaps from
bû to build, make (whence
boor, bower)
468 mergo seems explained
by S. majj – as frango is by
bhanj
mugil I suppose entirely
different from megha, ομιχλη
etc in all which the meaning of
mingo lies at the bottom. Where
as mugil "the covering" comes
from Can. mug (much) to cover
shut up
469 metta I fear from medu
radbh of mrdu – therefore
not referable to a Dravid. root –
W. ray = Tam [illegible]

p 470. vindu what comes from the sky or Vishnu

vertu = wāta Sanscr. from va (Germ. wehen)

bēdu Canarese shortening from bēndu, as bēku is from old bēlku. But the root may be either

vēṛ or vīl.

Tīl vrāy ?. = Tam. varei, Can. bare to draw lines & has no connection with eṛudu

p. 477. tē tel. ila ledu = iladu

p. 470. maku = [illegible]

p 478 anya also Hungarian mother, in Lappish edne, ædne

p. 479. [illegible] Hung. ala under

p 480. also Hung. ám yes, surely

īju Can. to swim, Hung. usz-ni

uḷ Hung. ül to sit

[illegible] to arrive Hung. jut (spear yet)

[illegible] Hung. keserü

katti Hung kes

p. 481 kaḍ Can & Tel. = kaḍ to bite
Hung. karap (Hung. k. corresponding
with Finnish k)
kattu Hung. köt - kotel rope
kaṇṇir Hung. könny
-48- kal. Hung kö
kal Hung tsal to cheat
kāl Hung. gyalog on foot
kira Hung kor age
p 483. kiru Can ?, Hung kis, kits small little
kiṭṭa near Hung közel
p 484 kel Hung. kér to ask, hir fame
p 485. chappu, suck, Hung szop
chāl line, furrow, Hung szāl thread
cher gather. Hung szed & szer to love
cherippu M shoe Hung tzipellö
chiragu T. M wing Hung szarny
chol T. M speak Hung szol
chōr M. (Can & Tul. sōru) to leak Hung tsorga
Suḍu T.M. Cotc. H süt to roast, süt bake
Sūl T pregnancy szül to bring forth
churukku to be narrow, choruga to turn in
Hung. szorit, szoros, szük

tarei T. M (teru M) to sprout H. terem

p. 486 tōlei T. (tilamton, tilakka Mal) to be full Hung. tel, töl full, fill

tonikku Hung tüani

nātige Can tongue, nyelv Hung

nagei Hung nevet

p. 487 podi dust Hung. por

por fight Hung pör

p. 488 puegei Hung füst

pul grass Hung. fü

pēsu speak Hung beszé

potta M. fool Hung buta

betta Can. mountain Hung. bérc

magu T. child, magzat H.

mārga – Hung. múl to perish

Maldives are in Malabar called

[illegible]

p. 489. murugu – Hung mély deep

muru Ta (Mal mura hard, excessive, more thick & entire) compare Hung merö quite, firm

mugal T. M (nosalu Tulu) hare – nyúl Hung

p. 489 mulei breast Hung. melly

vàḍi M. stick (also Tel. Can. Tul.) bot Hung

valla Mal. any Hung. vala any

vāy mouth Hung. ajak lip
száj mouth

vāṛ to flourish Hung boldog happy

ve boil, buz in Hung

vinei T. vina M. action, sin – Hung.
bűn sin

vir to unfold. Hung. virr to dawn
virāg to blossom

viru to fall, bukni Hung

vit to sow Hung. vet

vilakku a light világ

p 498. Are not Mālar to be derived from māl "black"

Thomas (April 9th 1866 Asiatic Society) pryst: The Aryans invented no alphabet of their own

1. Persian cuneiform from Assyr. & Assyr. from an antecedent Turanian symbolic character
2. Greek & Latin from Phoenician
3. Bactrian amplification of Phoenic.
4. Lât or Pâli alphabet originated to meet the requirements of Turanian, Dravid. dialects. Asoka's monoliths (lat) prove it to be the current writing of Indian Continent BC 250. (Norris, Caldwell). Hence Devanagari. — A similar if not identical character furnished the prototype of all Ind. alph fr Sindh to Ceylon & Burma, till Pâli meets Chinese Alphbt in Assam
5. Pehlvi from Phoenician, & thence Zend
6. The Aryan immigrants in Panjab (Vedic hymns) constructed an alphabet out of a very archaic type of Phoenician, whose graphic efficiency was singularly aided by the free use of birch bark. This continued as the official writing under Greek & Indo Scyth rulers of Northern India till superseded by the superior fitness of the local Pâli

91/321

Auszüge aus Caldwell's
Grammatik der dravidischen, d. h.
südindischen Sprachen

Caldwell: Comparative
[illegible]mar of the Dravidian
languages

the representative lan-
the family" in proof
the name தமிழ் might
to be identical with
The Malayal. versions of
as mention repeatedly
[illegible]ilas (= Draviḍas). d
[illegible]hangeable as in Vedic
[illegible] w. And ள = ழ as
from [illegible]. Damilo
[illegible]orm of Dramiḷa

called Malabar by the
because coming from
coast they found the
of the Paravas etc nearly
[illegible]ith that spoken in Ma-
always distinguish from
[illegible]gas or Telugus as the ruling class,
[illegible]y the Rayers (& max-
[illegible]ptions in South Travan

UB TÜBINGEN
Ma I 864-8.
Nr 8